

**UNPUBLISHED**

UNITED STATES COURT OF APPEALS  
FOR THE FOURTH CIRCUIT

---

**No. 97-2404**

---

GEORGE W. AMSTERDAM,

Plaintiff - Appellant,

versus

NORRELL SERVICES, INCORPORATED; MCI TELECOM-  
MUNICATIONS CORPORATION,

Defendants - Appellees.

---

Appeal from the United States District Court for the Eastern Dis-  
trict of Virginia, at Alexandria. Leonie M. Brinkema, District  
Judge. (CA-97-42-A)

---

Submitted: January 6, 1998

Decided: January 27, 1998

---

Before WILKINS, HAMILTON, and MICHAEL, Circuit Judges.

---

Affirmed by unpublished per curiam opinion.

---

George W. Amsterdam, Appellant Pro Se. William Lewis Stauffer, Jr., STAUFFER, MANNIX, ROMMEL, DECKER & DULANEY, L.L.C., McLean, Virginia; Peter John Petesch, FORD & HARRISON, L.L.P., Washington, D.C.; Lori Vaughn Ebersohl, SHAW, PITTMAN, POTTS & TROWBRIDGE, Washington, D.C.; Harvey D. Rumeld, MCI COMMUNICATIONS CORPORATION, Washington, D.C., for Appellees.

---

Unpublished opinions are not binding precedent in this circuit.  
See Local Rule 36(c).

PER CURIAM:

Appellant appeals the district court's order granting summary judgment to Defendants in this employment discrimination action. We have reviewed the record and the district court's order and find no reversible error. With regard to Appellant's claim that he was subjected to discriminatory working conditions because of his race, we find that Appellant failed to produce evidence that Defendants' legitimate, non-discriminatory reasons for Appellant's work assignment were pretextual. See Texas Dep't of Community Affairs v. Burdine, 450 U.S. 248, 252-53 (1981). Likewise, we find the district court's denial of relief on Appellant's failure to hire claim proper because Appellant did not demonstrate that Defendants' legitimate, non-discriminatory reason for failing to hire him was a pretext for racial discrimination. Id.

Accordingly, we affirm the district court's order. We dispense with oral argument because the facts and legal contentions are adequately presented in the materials before the court and argument would not aid the decisional process.

AFFIRMED